

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/666,469	09/19/2003	Katell Decamp	43869.046100	43869.046100 8868	
32361	7590 11/02/2004		EXAMINER		
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP			KYLE, MICHAEL J		
885 3RD AVENUE NEW YORK, NY 10022			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3676		
			DATE MAILED: 11/02/200	4	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/666,469	DECAMP, KATELL	S			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Michael J Kyle	3676				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addres	s			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timer within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this community (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nication.			
Status ·						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 At	ugust 2004.					
2a)⊠ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)☐ This						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce	epted or b) objected to by the I	Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		• •			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) △ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) △ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:  1. △ Certified copies of the priority documents 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive	on No	je			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	d.				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5)  Notice of Informal P 6)  Other:		)			

Application/Control Number: 10/666,469 Page 2

Art Unit: 3676

**DETAILED ACTION** 

Claim Objections

1. Claim 8 is objected to because of the limitations of an "inertial unit" and a "rack". Based

on claim 1, it appears as though the assembly is intended to fix a component to a support. It is

unclear, based on the limitations set forth in the claims, how an inertial unit and a rack relate to

the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for

failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as

the invention.

4. Claim 1 recites that the posterior part (3) of the peg (1) "is designed to compensate for

the clearance". It is unclear what structure allows for an object to "compensate" for a clearance

associated with another object. It appears as though the anterior portion is inserted with

clearance in the sleeve and the posterior portion is inserted without clearance in the sleeve.

However, this is not clearly presented in the claim.

5. Claims 2-8 depend from rejected claim 1, and include all of the limitations thereof.

Therefore, these claims are rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Application/Control Number: 10/666,469 Page 3

Art Unit: 3676

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on

sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fischer (U.S.

Patent No. 4,630,983). Fischer discloses a peg (1-5), a component (12) and a support (11). The

peg (1-5) comprises an anterior portion (5) that is introduced, with clearance, into a sleeve (13)

of the component (12). A posterior fixing par (between 1 and 5, in figure 1) is inserted in the

sleeve without clearance.

8. With respect to claims 2-4, Fischer discloses the diameter of the posterior fixing part to

be greater than the diameter of the sleeve, and the peg includes a slot (3). The peg has lateral

flats (on 8) and the posterior fixing portion has a cylindrical part.

9. With respect to claims 5 and 6, Fischer discloses the posterior fixing portion has a part

that that is inserted with clearance (where 1 meets the portion having the slot 3). That part is

frustoconical and situated behind the cylindrical part. Examiner considers both the portions to

the left and the right of the frustoconical part to be cylindrical portions.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the

manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3676

11. Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fischer in view of King, Jr. ("King", U.S. Patent No. 3,962,775). Fischer fails to disclose the peg to be coated with a graphite deposit.

12. King teaches the use of graphite on an expansion, in a sleeve, such as graphite, as a lubricant (column 12, lines 4-15). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Fischer, such that a graphite deposit is included on the peg, to lubricate the peg. The peg of Fischer fixes a component (12), or inertial unit, to support (11), or rack.

## Response to Arguments

13. Examiner appreciates applicant's response to the questions raised in the previous Office Action. Claim 1 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, because while applicant has defined the limitation "compensating for clearance" in the response filed on August 11, 2004, this language is still considered to be unclear, as explained above in paragraph 4.

## Conclusion

- 14. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).
- 15. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Application/Control Number: 10/666,469 Page 5

Art Unit: 3676

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

16. The following are suggested formats for either a Certificate of Mailing or Certificate of Transmission under 37 CFR 1.8(a). The certification may be included with all correspondence concerning this application or proceeding to establish a date of mailing or transmission under 37 CFR 1.8(a). Proper use of this procedure will result in such communication being considered as timely if the established date is within the required period for reply. The Certificate should be signed by the individual actually depositing or transmitting the correspondence or by an individual who, upon information and belief, expects the correspondence to be mailed or transmitted in the normal course of business by another no later than the date indicated.

## **Certificate of Mailing**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
on (Date)
Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:
Signature:
Certificate of Transmission
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No. (703) on  (Date)
Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:

Art Unit: 3676

Signature:	
_	 

Please refer to 37 CFR 1.6(d) and 1.8(a)(2) for filing limitations concerning facsimile transmissions and mailing, respectively.

- 17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael J Kyle whose telephone number is 703-305-3614. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday Friday, 8:30 am 5:00 pm.
- 18. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Shackelford can be reached on 703-308-2978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.
- 19. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

mk

Chuck Mah Primary Examiner Technology Center 3600